

REMARKS

Examiner noted that a new title of the invention is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Claims 24 to 29 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,511,949 (Thore) in view of U.S. 5,393,485 (Worz et al.). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore in view of Worz et al. and further in view of U.S. 5,900,207 (Danforth et al.). Claims 31, 32, 24 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore and Worz et al. and further in view of U.S. 6,648,596 (Grylls et al.). Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore in view of Worz et al. and Grylls et al. and further in view of U.S. 6,827,556 (Simon).

The title of the invention has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claims 24 to 29 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,511,949 (Thore) in view of U.S. 5,393,485 (Worz et al.). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore in view of Worz et al. and further in view of U.S. 5,900,207 (Danforth et al.). Claims 31, 32, 34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore and Worz et al. and further in view of U.S. 6,648,596 (Grylls et al.). Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thore in view of Worz et al. and Grylls et al. and further in view of U.S. 6,827,556 (Simon).

Independent claim 24 recites “cooling the at least one precursor when the defined degree of foaming is reached to terminate the foaming, the cooled at least one precursor being at least one gas turbine component having a closed and supporting exterior wall.”

The office Action cites to the Abstract of Worz for the limitation “closed and supporting exterior wall.” However, the wall discussed in Worz is the wall *of the wheel 3 with extruder groove 5*. See Worz at col. 2, lines 23 to 30 for example. This wall is not part of the foamed component.

Worz, it thus is respectfully submitted, does not teach or disclose “the cooled at least one

Response to Office Action of September 11, 2009

precursor being at least one gas turbine component having a closed and supporting exterior wall”
as claimed in claim 24.


Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 to 32, and 34 to 37 thus is respectfully
requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156)

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940